UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/705,657 | 11/10/2003 | Jeremy Thaler | 10770013010202 | 6140 | |
| 37211 BASCH & NIC | 7590 03/25/200 KERSON LLP | EXAMINER | | | |
| 1777 PENFIEL PENFIELD, NY | | PRATT, HELEN F | | | |
| PENFIELD, IN | 1 14320 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 1794 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 03/25/2009 | ELECTRONIC | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

dneels@bnpatentlaw.com dmasters@bnpatentlaw.com mnickerson@bnpatentlaw.com



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

| APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION | | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|---|-------------|--|----------------|---------------------|
| 10705657 | 11/10/2003 | THALER ET AL. | 10770013010202 | |
| | | | | |
| BASCH & NICKERSON LLP 1777 PENFIELD ROAD | | | Helen F Pratt | |
| PENFIELD, NY 1452 | 3 | | ART UNIT | PAPER |
| | | | 1794 | 20090317 |

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

Dear Sir:

The Examiner's Answer contains inconsistencies with the non-final rejection of 8-22-08 which are listed below.

The non-final rejection was reworked to consolidate the rejection of claim 24 over Hines et al. and to make the office action clearer in other instances.

The rejection of claims 1, 3-8, 10, 12-18, 20, 22-23as being unpatentable over Hinds and further in view of Baileys Industrial Oil and Fat Product',

"Baileys Industrial Oil and Fat Product" was not considered to add anything to the rejection, and was dropped from all the rejections. The rejection containing claim 24, only, found on page 9 of the non-final rejection of 8-22-08 was dropped i. e. "Claim 24 is rejected under... as being unpatentable over Hinds et al. as applied to the above claims, and further in view of Liu et al. (6,982,101), and claim 24 was addressed in the EX. Answer, (found on pages 10 and 11), in rejections "Claims 9, 11,19 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lui in view of Hinds et al. (UNHYDROGENATED PALM OIL as a Stabilizer for Peanut Butter) and Harris et al. (2,560,509) as applied to claims 1, 10, 12-18, 20, 22-23, and further in view of Krisinski et al. (4,143,176), and

"Claims 9, 11,19 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hinds et al. (UNHYDROGENATED PALM OIL as a Stabilizer for Peanut Butter) as applied to claims 1, 3-8, 10, 12-18, 20, 22-23 and further in view of Krisinski et al. (4,143,176)."

Also, in this rejection, Harris et al. was dropped as never being in the rejection of Hinds et al. in view of Bailey's Industrial Oil and Fat Products. on page 6 of the non-final rejection.

In the rejection found on page 10 of the EX A., "Liu in view of "was inserted before "Hinds et al." so as to be consistent with the first rejection found on page 2 of the non-final office action of 8-22-08, i. e. "Claims 9, 11,19 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lui in view of Hinds et al. (UNHYDROGENATED PALM OIL as a Stabilizer for Peanut Butter) and Harris et al. (2,560,509) as applied to claims 1, 10, 12-18, 20, 22-23, and further in view of Krisinski et al. (4,143,176). No new ground of rejection is seen since the basic thrust of the rejection remains the same, and reliance upon fewer reference does not constitute a new ground of rejection. MPEP 1207.03, part III.

PTO-90C (Rev.04-03)